

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner states that the inventions of Groups I and II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship under M.P.E.P. §806.04(b) and that the intermediate products are deemed to be useful as molding compositions, or in the manufacture of films.

However, it can be seen that the inventions of Groups I and II are not species of one another, nor does the intermediate lose its identity in the final product, as is typically the case with an intermediate-final product relationship. The relationship between Groups I and II is actually that of combination-subcombination under M.P.E.P. §806.05(c) in which the stain-proofing agent of Group I is the subcombination and the compositions and article of the claims of Group II are the combination. Two-way distinctness is required to be shown to justify restriction between inventions in a combination-subcombination relationship. Since two-way distinctness has not been shown between the inventions of Groups I and II, it is requested that the claims of Groups I and II be rejoined and examined in the present application.

Accordingly, for the reasons presented above, it is submitted that the Patent and Trademark Office has not met the requirements necessary to sustain the restriction requirement. Withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
REM/rac



Roland E. Martin
Registration No. 48,082